Production - Natural Gas STAR Annual Report - 2005

Company Information

Company Name: **TOTAL E&P USA, INC.**

Gas STAR Contact: **Keith M. Boedecker**

Title **Environmental Manager**

Address: **800 Gessner**

Suite 700

City: **Houston**

State: **TX**

Zip: **77024**

Phone: **(713) 647-3550**

Fax: **(713) 647-3979**

E-mail: **keith.boedecker@total.com**

Entered 4/10/06 TH

QA/QC OF 5/5/06

Company Information Updated: Yes

Activities Reported

BMP1: Yes BMP2: Yes BMP3: Yes

Total Methane Emission Reductions Reported This Year: **5,791**

Previous Years' Activities Reported: **No**

Period Covered by Report

From: **01/01/2005** To: **12/31/2005**

Additional Comments

All onshore locations were divested to other operators during the first quarter of 2006. No activities will be realized next year.

no roll up for anything done this year on shore

TOTAL E&P USA, INC.
BMP1: Identify and Replace High-Bleed Pneumatic Devices

Current Year Activities

A. Facility Summary

Number of devices replaced this reporting period: _____ **devices**
Percent of system now equipped with low/no-bleed units: _____ **%**

B. Cost Summary

Estimated cost per replacement (including equipment and labor): **$** _____

C. Methane Emissions Reduction

Method Used: _____
Data Source:
Methane Emissions Reduction: _____ **Mcf/year**

D. Duration of Activity

Number of years that methane emissions reductions will be realized: **7 years**

E. Total Value of Gas Saved

Value of Gas Saved: **$** _____
$ / Mcf used: **$ 3.00**

F. Planned Future Activities
Number of high-bleed devices to be replicated next year: _____ **devices**

Previous Years' Activities

Year	Number of Devices	Total Cost * ($)	Estimated Reductions (Mcf/Yr)	Value of Gas Saved ($)

* Total cost of replacements (including equipment and labor)

Additional Comments

No high bleed pneumatic devices were replaced in 2005.

TOTAL E&P USA, INC.
BMP2: Install Flash Tank Separators on Glycol Dehydrators

Current Year Activities

A. Facility Summary

Number of flash tank separators installed this reporting period: _____ **flash tanks**
Percent of dehydrators in system equipped with flash tank separators: _____ **%**

B. Cost Summary

Estimated cost per flash tank separator replacement (including equipment and labor): **$** _____

C. Methane Emissions Reduction

Method Used: **Calculation Using Default**
Data Source: **Not Applicable**
Methane Emissions Reduction: _____ **Mcf/year**

Flash Tank Installation Number	TEG circulation rate (gal/hr)	Methane entrainment rate (scf/gal)	Hours of operation (hrs/yr)

Total # Flash Tanks Installed: **2**

D. Duration of Activity

Number of years that methane emissions reductions will be realized: _____ **years**

E. Total Value of Gas Saved

Value of Gas Saved: **$** _____
$ / Mcf used: **$ 3.00**

F. Planned Future Activities
Number of flash tank separators to be installed next year: _____ **flash tanks**

Previous Years' Activities

Year	# of Flash Tank Separators Installed	Total Cost * ($)	Estimated Reductions (Mcf/Yr)	Value of Gas Saved ($)

* Total cost of installations (including equipment and labor)

Additional Comments
No Flash tank separators were installed in 2005.

TOTAL E&P USA, INC.
BMP3: Partner Reported Opportunities (PROs)
Eliminate unnecessary equipment and/or systems

Current Year Activities

A. Description of PRO
A review of the current equipment was performed at one of the primary South Texas locations. It was determined that one of the gas-operated diaphragm pumps installed at the facility was not required for continuous operations and was subsequently removed.

B. Level of Implementation

One gas-operated diaphragm pump was removed from service.

C. Methane Emissions Reduction
Methane Emissions Reduction: **493.30 Mcf/year**

Basis for the emissions reduction estimate: **Calculation using manufacturer specifications**

D. Duration of PRO
Number of years that methane emissions reductions will be realized: ~~**10 years**~~ **1-year**

E. Cost Summary
Estimated cost of implementing the PRO (including equipment and labor): **$ 250**

F. Total Value of Gas Saved
Value of Gas Saved: **$ 1,479.90**
$ / Mcf used: **$ 3.00**

G. Planned Future Activities
To what extent do you expect to implement this PRO next year?: **All onshore locations were divested to other operators during the first quarter of 2006. No activities will be realized next year.**

Previous Years' Activities

Year	Frequency of practice or # of Installations	Total Cost * ($)	Estimated Reductions (Mcf/Yr)	Value of Gas Saved ($)
1990				

TOTAL E&P USA, INC.
BMP3: Partner Reported Opportunities (PROs)
Eliminate unnecessary equipment and/or systems

1991
1992
1993
1994
1995
1996
1997
1998
1999
2000
2001
2002
2003
2004

* Total cost of practice/activity (including equipment and labor)

Additional Comments

All onshore locations were divested to other operators during the first quarter of 2006. No activities will be realized next year.

TOTAL E&P USA, INC.
BMP3: Partner Reported Opportunities (PROs)
Install condenser on glycol vent

Current Year Activities

A. Description of PRO
A condenser was installed at one of the South Texas locations. The exhaust was further controlled by a combustion source.

B. Level of Implementation
Number of units installed: **1 units**

C. Methane Emissions Reduction
Methane Emissions Reduction: **7.90 Mcf/year**

Basis for the emissions reduction estimate: **Other**

Calculations are based upon the regulatory agency permitted potential-to-emit emissions. Actual emissions from this source are unavailable. Emissions were estimated to be a reduction of 0.2 tons of CH4 in 2005 (annualized value of 0.3 tons/year). Estimated meth reductions reflect 2005 reduction only - not the annualized values. Emissions were estimated using GRI Gly-Calc software.

D. Duration of PRO
Number of years that methane emissions reductions will be realized: ~~**10 years**~~ 1-year

E. Cost Summary
Estimated cost of implementing the PRO (including equipment and labor): **$ 18,000**

F. Total Value of Gas Saved
Value of Gas Saved: **$ 23.70**
$ / Mcf used: **$ 3.00**

G. Planned Future Activities
To what extent do you expect to implement this PRO next year?: **All onshore locations were divested to other operators during the first quarter of 2006. No activities will be realized next year.**

then everything should be 1-year

Previous Years' Activities

Year	Frequency of practice or # of Installations	Total Cost * ($)	Estimated Reductions (Mcf/Yr)	Value of Gas Saved ($)
1990				

TOTAL E&P USA, INC.
BMP3: Partner Reported Opportunities (PROs)
Install condenser on glycol vent

1991
1992
1993
1994
1995
1996
1997
1998
1999
2000
2001
2002
2003
2004

* Total cost of practice/activity (including equipment and labor)

Additional Comments

All onshore locations were divested to other operators during the first quarter of 2006. No activities will be realized next year.

TOTAL E&P USA, INC.
BMP3: Partner Reported Opportunities (PROs)
Install flares

Current Year Activities

A. Description of PRO
Well testing activities are measured for internal reporting requirements. Some well test activities were controlled by flares due to the expected length of time testing was planned or the volume of gas being emitted during the tests.

B. Level of Implementation

Three temporary flares were used in 2005 by the well testing company to burn gas released during well testing activities.

C. Methane Emissions Reduction
Methane Emissions Reduction: **4,857.00 Mcf/year**

Basis for the emissions reduction estimate: **Actual field measurement**

D. Duration of PRO
Number of years that methane emissions reductions will be realized: **1 years**

E. Cost Summary
Estimated cost of implementing the PRO (including equipment and labor): **$** _____

F. Total Value of Gas Saved
Value of Gas Saved: ~~**$ 14,571.00**~~ $0- Gas is destroyed, not saved
$ / Mcf used: $ 3.00

G. Planned Future Activities
To what extent do you expect to implement this PRO next year?: **All onshore properties were divested to other operators during the first quarter of 2006. The potential for ~~flaring from offshore operations still~~ exists and will be evaluated as ~~necessary.~~**

Previous Years' Activities

Year	Frequency of practice or # of Installations	Total Cost * ($)	Estimated Reductions (Mcf/Yr)	Value of Gas Saved ($)
1990				

TOTAL E&P USA, INC.
BMP3: Partner Reported Opportunities (PROs)
Install flares

1991
1992
1993
1994
1995
1996
1997
1998
1999
2000
2001
2002
2003
2004

* Total cost of practice/activity (including equipment and labor)

Additional Comments

The cost associated with the use of the temporary flares is unknown. This service is provided by the well testing company. In addition, the duration of the benefits has been reported as one year. This activity cannot be annualized over long term due to the non-routine aspect of the well testing activity.

TOTAL E&P USA, INC.
BMP3: Partner Reported Opportunities (PROs)
Link dehydrator unit to incinerator

Current Year Activities

A. Description of PRO
The flash tank separator on one glycol dehydrator unit located at a South Texas facility was controlled by routing the emissions to the reboiler fire box.

B. Level of Implementation

During the installation of the condenser controls on the glycol unit, the flash tank emissions were also controlled by routing the emissions to the reboiler firebox. Reboiler is estimated to operate for 50% of year. Methane was combusted during the operating time of the reboiler and vented to atmosphere during non-operating times of the reboiler.

C. Methane Emissions Reduction
Methane Emissions Reduction: **433.10 Mcf/year**

Basis for the emissions reduction estimate: **Other**

Calculations are based upon the regulatory agency permitted potential-to-emit emissions. Actual emissions from this source are unavailable. Emissions were estimated to be a reduction of 9.1 tons of CH4 in 2005 (annualized value of 18.3 tons/year). Estimated methane reductions reflect 2005 reduction only - not the annualized values. Emissions estimated using GRI Gly-Calc software.

D. Duration of PRO
Number of years that methane emissions reductions will be realized: ~~**10 years**~~ 1-year

E. Cost Summary
Estimated cost of implementing the PRO (including equipment and labor): **$ 4,000**

F. Total Value of Gas Saved
Value of Gas Saved: **$ 1,299.30**
$ / Mcf used: **$ 3.00**

G. Planned Future Activities
To what extent do you expect to implement this PRO next year?: **All onshore locations were divested to other operators during the first quarter of 2006. No activities will be realized next year.**

Previous Years' Activities

Year	Frequency of practice or # of Installations	Total Cost * ($)	Estimated Reductions (Mcf/Yr)	Value of Gas Saved ($)
1990				

TOTAL E&P USA, INC.
BMP3: Partner Reported Opportunities (PROs)
Link dehydrator unit to incinerator

1991
1992
1993
1994
1995
1996
1997
1998
1999
2000
2001
2002
2003
2004

* Total cost of practice/activity (including equipment and labor)

Additional Comments

All onshore locations were divested to other operators during the first quarter of 2006. No activities will be realized next year.

TOTAL E&P USA, INC.
Additional Accomplishments